



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/687,892

10/13/2000

Phillip Koh-Kwe Hsu

74622-014

8983

21890

7590

07/10/2008

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

PATENT DEPARTMENT

1585 BROADWAY

NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299

EXAMINER

CHANDLER, SARA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/687,892	Applicant(s) HSU ET AL.	
	Examiner SARA CHANDLER	Art Unit 3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27,28,30-34,36-38,41-43,45 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37,38,41-43,45 and 46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27,28,30-34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's arguments and request for reconsideration of application 09/687,892 (10/13/00) filed on 02/19/08.

Claim Interpretation

1. In determining patentability of an invention over the prior art, all claim limitations have been considered and interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. See MPEP § 2111.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Pruter*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). See MPEP § 2111.

2. All claim limitations have been considered. Additionally, all words in the claims have been considered in judging the patentability of the claims against the prior art. The following language is interpreted as not further limiting the scope of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2106 II C.

Language in a method claim that states only the intended use or intended result, but the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim. Language in a system claim that states only the intended use or intended result, but does not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art.

In other words, if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as “*if, may, might, can could*”, as optional language. As matter of linguistic precision, optional claim elements do not narrow claim limitations, since they can always be omitted.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as “*wherein, whereby*”, that fail to further define the steps or acts to be performed in method claims or the discrete physical structure required of system claims.

USPTO personnel should begin claim analysis by identifying and evaluating each claim limitation. For processes, the claim limitations will define steps or acts to be performed. For products, the claim limitations will define discrete physical structures or materials. Product claims are claims that are directed to either machines, manufactures or compositions of matter. See MPEP § 2106 II C.

The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) “adapted to” or “adapted for” clauses,
- (C) “wherein” clauses, or
- (D) “whereby” clauses.

See MPEP § 2106 II C.

3. Independent claims are examined together, since they are not patentable distinct. If applicant expressly states on the record that two or more independent and distinct

inventions are claimed in a single application, the Examiner may require the applicant to elect an invention to which the claims will be restricted.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 37-38, 41-43 and 42-46 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 27-28, 30-34, 36, drawn to a computer system that delivers financial messages to individual clients.
- II. Claims 37-38 and 41, drawn to a system that provides access a financial message delivery system in a financial computer system.
- III. Claims 42-43 and 45-46, drawn to a computerized method for delivering one financial messages to individual clients.

The following inventions are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions I and II: In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a registration system module that registers user preferences that determine financial messages to deliver to individual clients; and a message creation system module that automatically creates financial messages in accordance with the registered user preferences for the individual clients. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as a first interface module access that presents a user interface to

view and modify user preferences that determine financial messages to automatically create and deliver to individual clients.

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as a first interface module access that presents a user interface to view and modify user preferences that determine financial messages to automatically create and deliver to individual clients.

The following inventions are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)).

Inventions I and III: In this case the apparatus has a registration system module that can be used for registering user preferences that determine financial messages to deliver to individual clients.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 37-38, 41-43 and 45-46 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03. [Note: Applicant may wish to submit a single independent system claim w/dependent claims and if desired method, computer readable medium claims

etc. where the limitations clearly correlate to system claims except for differences due to statutory class.]

Claim Objections

Claims 27-28, 30-34 and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Note: Applicant should review the notes supra regarding the interpretation afforded the claimed invention. The claims are considered in light of what the systems components are operable to do and the process steps required of the invention. The claims are drafted in such a way that makes it unclear what the system is operable to do or required to do. (e.g., "to enable").

. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 27-28, 30-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Re Claim 27: The preamble of claim 27 suggests that it is drawn to a system. The preamble of claim 27 states, "A computer system that delivers financial messages to individual clients comprising:" The body of the claim however, only describes "modules" and the broadest reasonable interpretation of what a "module" is would suggest that it is only software. This interpretation is supported by applicant's specification which states:

It is understood that the various devices, modules, mechanisms and systems described herein may be realized in hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software. (Applicant's Specification, pg. 7)

Claim 27 is not a proper system claim because it does not recite structural components and it does not recite structural components working together to operate the system. Claim 27 is defined purely as software and software per se is not statutory subject matter. Software is not one of the four enumerated statutory categories. [Note: Applicant may wish to see Fig. 1 of specification regarding necessary structural components].

Dependent claims are rejected based on the same rationale as the claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the content". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3693

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 27-28, 30-34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frerichs, US Pat. No. 6,684,249.

Re Claims 27-28, 30-34, 36: Frerichs discloses a computer system that delivers messages to individual clients comprising:

a messaging system that further comprises (Frerichs, Fig. 1, abstract, col. 1, lines 1-20; col. 1, lines 65+ - col. 3, line 32; col. 4, lines 19-57; col. 6, line 30+ - col. 7, line 5; col. 7, lines 40-58; col. 8, lines 39-54):

a registration system module that registers the client user's user preferences that determine messages to deliver to individual clients be received by the client user (Frerichs, Fig. 1, abstract, col. 1, lines 1-20; col. 1, lines 65+ - col. 3, line 32; col. 4, lines 19-57; col. 6, line 30+ - col. 7, line 5; col. 7, lines 40-58; col. 8, lines 39-54);

a message creation system module that automatically creates messages in accordance with the client user's registered user preferences for the individual clients, for delivery of the messages for reception by the client user (Frerichs, Fig. 1, abstract, col. 1, lines 1-

Art Unit: 3693

20; col. 1, lines 65+ - col. 3, line 32; col. 4, lines 19-57; col. 6, line 30+ - col. 7, line 5; col. 7, lines 40-58; col. 8, lines 39-54); and

an intervention system module that delays delivery of at least one of the messages to an individual client and during the delay, presents the at least one message through a user interface to enable manual modification of the content of the at least one message resulting in a modified message, the modified message being delivered to the individual client (Frerichs, Fig. 1, abstract, col. 1, lines 1-20; col. 1, lines 65+ - col. 3, line 32; col. 4, lines 19-57; col. 6, line 30+ - col. 7, line 5; col. 7, lines 40-58; col. 8, lines 39-54).

Frerichs fails to explicitly disclose wherein the message is a financial message.

Regarding wherein the message is a financial message.

Analogous art: It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Frerichs addresses the problems of modifying messages prior to delivery.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Frerichs to provide wherein the message is a financial message.

As Frerichs suggests, customizing and/or modifying messages prior to their deliver to clients was old and well known in fields such as advertising. Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are

predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the claimed subject matter likely would have been obvious under KSR. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following references pertain to modifying messages prior to delivery.

US Pat. No. 7,337,127; and US Pat. No. 6,654,725.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARA CHANDLER whose telephone number is (571)272-1186. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMC

/JAGDISH N PATEL/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693